UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Special Announcement

UNITY takes pleasure in announcing for special publication during the summer months three important articles on India and the Revolution.

by

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR, Ph. D.

Mr. Muzumdar, a native citizen of India, is author of "Gandhi Versus the Empire," the most recent book on India, which has attracted wide and favorable attention in the press. He is a friend and follower of Gandhi and participated in the famous March to Dandi in 1929. Thoroughly conversant with Indian affairs Mr. Muzumdar enjoys the advantage as an interpreter of India to the American people of long residence in this country and of undergraduate and graduate study in our universities.

This special series of articles will confirm and strengthen UNITY's position as the leading interpreter in this country of Gandhi and the Indian movement of independence.

VOLUME CXI NUMBER 20

Chicago, August 7, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter July 30, 1931, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
FREDERICK STARR
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 311

"How May We End War?"—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 313

ARTICLES—

An Ancient Sanskrit Prayer..... 311

Social Democracy and Empire—REGINALD REYNOLDS..... 315

The Birth-Pangs of a New Era—WALTER VOGELMANN..... 316

What Price Intelligence?—ROBERT WHITAKER..... 319

THE STUDY TABLE—

Henry George—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 320

"Once Upon a Time and Today"—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL... 321

CORRESPONDENCE—

The Hitler Horror—H. 322

Defense of India—SYDNEY STRONG 322

THE FIELD—

World Fellowship of Faiths..... 310

Memorandum from Editor Strong..... 324

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

World Fellowship of Faiths Youth and the Future

At the meeting held on July 11th at the Hotel Morrison, Chicago, President Emeritus, C. F. Thwing, of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, spoke on "The College President and His Student." As the first qualification of a president he cited sympathy.

"This intellectual principle, moral virtue and social grace are structural in administration. The principle, the virtue, and the grace, although each is in a sense dependent, do exist and cooperate as a trinity. The lack of either breaks up the tri-unity. All should be and work as one. Without the intellectual principle, the moral virtue is in peril of becoming insincere, and the grace superficial or impossible. Without the virtue and the feeling of sympathy, the principle has little power of application or of effectiveness, and the grace, in turn, becomes coldly individualistic. Without the social grace, however firmly lodged may be the principle or however intense the feeling of the virtue of sympathy, the want of the social grace may result in actual misunderstanding and boorish blundering.

"A friend of mine, no longer living, was elected to the presidency of a historic New England college. A graduate of the college asked a friend, who knew the president well, 'What kind of a president will Dr. ——— make?' The answer was, 'He will make a first-rate president if he can have a man to eat up every morning before breakfast.' The man in the form of a student could not readily be furnished; and therefore presently the college president ceased to live as a president. Understanding, good will, sympathy are essential.

"In this good will the virtue and grace of patience is essential. . . . The need of this is especially manifest in the president's dealings with those characteristics of his students which are shown in riots, strikes, disturbances, and all similar outbreaks. They seem to have been especially numerous and violent in recent months. The depression may have created a nervousness which breeds such disorders. Its com-

(*Continued on page* 323)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXI MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 1933 Number 20

AN ANCIENT SANSKRIT PRAYER

(Used at the opening meeting of the Fellowship of Faiths by Mr. Kedarnath Das Gupta of India, Chicago, 1933.)

Translation: May He who is One without second, who is beyond all distinction of color, caste and creed, who, knowing all our needs meets them with His manifold powers; may He who is in the beginning, in the middle, and in the end; may He unite us in fellowship and understanding.

Sanskrit: *Sam gacchadhvam sam vadadhvam sam vo manamsi janatam.* **"Together walk ye, together speak ye, together know ye your minds." (Rig Veda.)**

The Boston *Herald* thinks that Mahatma Gandhi is "down and out."—We have heard this before! The great Indian, so we were told, was "down and out" in 1922, when he called off the non-cooperation movement, and was promptly arrested. He was "down and out" again in 1924, when he retired from political activities, and left to others the leadership of the *Swaraj* movement. But always the Mahatma has a way of rising up. Personally, we cannot see the slightest evidence at present of loss of power and command. After a year and a half in prison, Gandhi has emerged the supreme leader of his people, and has registered a great victory at the latest Congress meeting. The fight for independence is to go on along the lines laid down by the Mahatma from the beginning. The refusal of the Viceroy, Lord Willingdon, to meet Gandhi involves no defeat or humiliation for India. In accordance with the invariable custom of his life, the Mahatma was leaving no stone unturned to bring reconciliation and peace to the Empire. If the agonizing struggle is to continue, it must be Britain that decrees it; and Gandhi's maneuver has thus placed responsibility precisely where it belongs—at the Viceroy's threshold. What is constantly ignored in our western judgments upon the Indian situation is, first, the hold which Gandhi has upon his people—a hold fundamentally spiritual and not political in character; and, secondly, the principles upon the basis of which the Indians are conducting their campaign. These principles have nothing of physical power and might in them, and thus know nothing of victory and defeat as we understand these terms. Out of the very defeat of Gandhi, as we look at it, may come victory, as out of the cross of Jesus came triumph. What we know is that India has decided to *go on,* under the leadership of a man of consummate statesmanship and heroic spiritual passion. That this decision is satisfactory to all but British imperialists is, or should be, manifest.

What chances the Roman Catholic Church misses! Think of the opportunity for high spiritual leadership granted to the Vatican by the Hitler regime in Germany! Nothing could be more appalling to the religious soul than what the Nazis are doing in that unhappy country. We think so highly of His Holiness, the Pope, that we must believe that the rule of the Social Democrats is offensive to his person. As offensive as the rule of the Kaiser's troopers was to Cardinal Mercier in Belgium in 1914! Why should not the Pope follow the example of his immortal Cardinal, and hurl the anathema of the Church upon Hitler and all his works? All the more as Hitler, technically at least, is himself a Catholic! But politics, as sacred at the Vatican as at Tammany Hall, has decreed otherwise, and the Church has disheartened civilization by making terms with Berlin. We count this a grievous betrayal of religion, all the more in the light of Protestantism's heroic resistance to the Nazi tyranny. Just what has happened in German Protestantism we do not know in any detail. But this is plain—that, when every other organization in the Reich, political and social, was either surrendering or running away, the Lutheran churches stood their ground and refused to obey orders, or even to be intimidated. Even now, after unmistakable demonstration of Hitler's determination and power, these churches still refuse to bow the knee. They may be forced to kneel, even to fall prostrate, but it will be sheer helplessness and not compromise, least of all surrender, which will be involved. Something of old Luther is in German Protestantism yet. The martyr-spirit of the early Christians is not dead. If, in this hour of incredible arrogance and tyranny, Roman Catholicism had but joined hands with Protestantism, perhaps the hold of the Nazis upon the Reich, if not broken, would at least be less firm than it now is.

Under the Farm Relief Bill, a fourth of all the cotton planted in this country will be plowed under and thus destroyed. In return a federal tax of 4.2

cents a pound will be put on the processing of cotton, and the proceeds, expected to total $210,000,000, will be paid over to the destroying farmers. If this scheme is sound, as wise men tell us it is, then we should like to know why it should not be extended. Years ago a radical leader, denounced as an anarchist, declared that the way to get prosperity was to destroy property as fast as it was used. Drink a glass of water, and then smash the glass; eat a plate of beans, and then break the plate; and so on. This preachment in its day was regarded as crazy—and we think it was! And by the same token we regard this destruction of the cotton crop as crazy. Why not cultivate and protect the boll weevil, and have done with it? Why not burn up a fourth of all the houses in the country, smash up a fourth of all the locomotives, tear up a fourth of all the boots and shoes, and make everybody as happy as cotton-planters? If human beings had all the cotton they could use, if all bodies were clothed not only in this country but in India and China, then this restriction of out-put might be defensible. Economic planning is of course based, as an elementary principle, upon not only adequate but full supply of human needs. But the trouble now, as we cannot insist too often, is *not* over-production but under-consumption. Hence, to attempt to solve our problems by cutting down production is sheer insanity. Worst of all, it is sheer indecency, for it is a deliberate attempt to capitalize the needs of men in the interest of private profits. It is exploitation at its crudest and cruelest. Such a scheme cannot and ought not to succeed. It will fail if only because there is cotton grown elsewhere in the world, and international competition, on the basis of higher prices, will be fatal. Roosevelt's economic nationalism, in other words, if continued, is doomed to wreck his domestic program of reform.

Will some little boy tell the class, please, the names of the men in President Roosevelt's Cabinet? What! Doesn't some little boy know these names? Come, Johnny, you try! Secretary of State? . . . No! —not Mr. Moley. He's in the Department, but he's not the Secretary. Mr. Hull is the Secretary—Mr. *Hull!* You're heard of *him.* Now, the Secretary of the Treasury! Who knows the Secretary of the Treasury? Nobody?—Why, don't you remember the Morgan investigation, and the man who got all the favors from Wall Street? No!—not McAdoo. He was the Secretary of the Treasury in President Wilson's Cabinet. The present Secretary is . . . I shall have to give you the name. Mr. Woodin—yes, *Woodin!* Now we will go on—the Secretary of War? . . . Nobody knows—not a single member of the class! Well, well —we shall have to study this lesson some more. Get out some newspapers, children, and go over them very carefully. Don't bother with the front pages—the names of the Cabinet officers never appear there. But hunt in the out-of-the-way corners—yes, Johnny, the "Lost and Found" column might be a good place—and the obituary column, too—and, if you look long enough and hard enough, you'll find the names. Then learn them—for you may never see them again. For the Cabinet in this administration seems to be absolutely of no account. Never in the history of the country has there been a President so scornful of his legal advisors. Jackson, to be sure, had his "kitchen cabinet," as Roosevelt has his "brain trust." But the official Cabinet in Jackson's day was an important body of important men, whereas the present Cabinet, whether because of individual insignificance, or because of the deliberate contempt of the chief executive, is of absolutely no importance at all. Moley, Tugwell, Howe, Berle, Johnson, Eastman, Baruch, Sprague—these are the men who count in this administration. Ickes is the only Cabinet member who seems to rank with these favorites at all. Which raises interesting questions!—what do we have a Cabinet for, and how long are its members, some of them by no means nonentities, going to be content with their obscurity?

Kidnapping is a great game—popular and profitable. When the Lindbergh baby was stolen, we were told that this was the last of these monstrous crimes. Public indignation was awake, and would wipe out this offense forever! But as a matter of fact, the great and general public got a tremendous "kick" out of the Lindbergh outrage—the biggest "kick" since the War —and now kidnapping has become something like an accepted out-door sport. Not merely children, but grown-ups—old men and young men—are the victims of the thieves. Anybody, apparently, can be safely seized, and then it is a matter of only a few days, and of a careful arranging of communication, for the ransom money to be turned over, and the victim released. A great game—and as safe as it is great! There was a time when ransoms were refused, and the police not called off but called in. Today, however, that type of Spartan courage is a minus quantity, and the police are no longer trusted. What a commentary on our moral fibre, our standards of law and order, our whole civilization, that such an abomination should not only exist but actually flourish! That a "racket" like this should be successfully organized as a method of extracting money out of the people, and run with a minimum of danger and a maximum of profit, means either that our government is definitely in the hands of the criminal classes, or else that a complacent public gets enough excitement out of these sensational exploits to make them worth while. What disgusts us to the point of nausea is the outcry of the people, the high resolves and mighty threats of the legal authorities, the indignant editorials of the newspapers—and

then, nothing done about it! This is hypocrisy added to crime, which ought to make Americans hang their heads in shame. One thing is as clear as day. We refer to the fact that in all other civilized countries, the crime of kidnapping is wellnigh unknown. Which raises the question, Is America civilized?

Flying is wonderful, no doubt about that! It is going on day and night, carrying passengers and mail over great distances, without accident or alarm. Yet we never feel so sure of the irremovable limitations on this method of transportation as when it is undertaken on a really large scale. Take the much-heralded flight of Balbo and his Italians, for example! Here was a perfectly simple undertaking of a group of highly trained aviators to fly from Italy to the United States. If flying is the exact science or accomplished art it is said to be by its zealous advocates, this journey should have been achieved easily, gracefully, expeditiously, and safely. As a matter of fact, it was not achieved at all as planned, but carried through only after long delay and sad disaster. At the start, it seemed as though the winged ships would never get off—the weather was unfavorable. (Imagine a railroad train or even a steamship being interminably delayed by clouds, or winds, or fog!) After the start, the ships made their way to Holland, where one member of the air-fleet suffered disaster, with the resulting death of one man, a mechanician, and the injury of three others. Then the flyers crossed to Ireland, where they were again held up day after day by "unfavorable weather in the region of Iceland." When once they were able to cross the seas to this arctic isle, there was another delay. An attempt to get off after days of waiting, failed completely owing to the inability of Balbo to raise his ship into the air. Finally, like birds with broken wings, the aeroplanes managed to fly to Labrador. From this point there was speedy progress to Montreal, but the arrival in Chicago was hours behind the schedule announced for the last lap of the flight. When finally the fleet rested on Lake Michigan, more than two weeks had passed since the actual departure from Italy. The event was everywhere hailed as the most wonderful achievement of its kind in aviation history. And it *was!* But this very fact only serves to demonstrate under what restrictions the art of flying is conducted. The aeroplane has an established place in contemporary life, but it is going to be a long, long time before man is a flying animal.

J. H. H.

"How May We End War?"

This subject, "How May We End War," reminds me of an address which I heard some weeks ago from a distinguished Admiral of the U. S. Navy. His answer to our question was precise, direct, absolutely honest—*war cannot be ended!* His appeal was to history. From the beginning of time, he said, man has fought; and we may be sure that, to the end of time, or of himself, he will continue to fight. After every war, said the Admiral, man goes through an experience of disillusionment and revulsion, and resolves that he will never again resort to arms. We have been going through just such an experience as this since the close of the Great War. But sooner or later man's instinctive nature reasserts itself, a new and unspoiled generation comes along, a fresh quarrel breaks out—and the next war is at hand.

The fact of the matter is, say our friends the admirals and generals and munition-makers and politicians and super-patriots generally, war is inevitable because it is rooted in human nature. Man fights, as he will continue to fight, because he is a fighting animal. It is a part of his essential character to struggle, and contend, and destroy. War, to be sure, is a different thing today from what it used to be in earlier and more primitive days. Custom has made it a thing of gorgeous panoply and vast organization—it uses terrific weapons and stupendous machines—it is sustained by heroic traditions and noble virtues—but at bottom it remains what it has always been, the ancient jungle strife of tooth and claw. Marching armies and bloody battlefields, in other words, are nothing but the supreme illustration of what is done when human nature is engaged in its primary business of seeking and guarding its own. If we could change human nature, say the militarists, we might be able to end war. But we can't change human nature, and therefore we can't end war.

Now this is a very commonplace and familiar statement. It sounds plausible—and it might be convincing, if it were not for the actual record of history and testimony of human nature. One look into the past, and immediately something seems to be wrong with the argument. For it is perfectly plain, that, through the centuries gone by, man has all the time been steadily getting rid of war by emancipating his human nature from the insidious challenge and appeal of war. In area after area of social life war has completely disappeared from just the places where it formerly flourished, and seemed to be planted forever; and in these places you could no more get men to fight today than you could get them to howl as wolves, or devour as lions. How can we end war? Why, war has already been ended! Let me show you what I mean:

Suppose the Astor family and the Vanderbilt family in New York should declare war upon one another, and call upon brave, loyal, patriotic citizens to take up arms in defense of their lands, their wealth, or their outraged honor. Of course, nobody would respond to such a summons. And yet it was only a few centuries ago that the Lancastrian and the York families of England were ferociously fighting, and all true Englishmen arrayed on one side or the other.

Suppose, again, that New York City should get into a furious dispute with Boston, or Chicago with Philadelphia, and each city should undertake to raise

an army of soldier-boys to attack and destroy its enemy. Few people would be interested in the fight, except to stop it. Yet in Italy, in the hectic period of the early Renaissance, Genoa and Florence and Pisa and Venice all maintained their separate armies, made war upon each other, and demanded that their citizens, as a test of patriotism, should be ardently loyal to the municipal cause.

Again, suppose that Pennsylvania should try to go to war with Maryland, or Delaware with New Jersey! How many of us would tolerate such an egregious exhibition of anarchy and barbarism? Yet, in the Middle Ages, wars between states were frequent, and patriots were as loyal to Savoy and Burgundy and Normandy, as now they are loyal to the great nations which include these half-forgotten provinces.

Suppose that England should make war upon Scotland, or Scotland upon England, as Poland may still make upon Germany, or Germany upon France. In the case of England and Scotland the idea is unthinkable. Yet for a thousand years these two nations bathed their frontiers with the blood of knights and peasants.

Men live together in their social relationships today as they have always lived—in families, and cities, and provinces, and states, and nations. The human nature involved in these various relationships is the same old substance of physical, intellectual, and moral qualities that has been since the beginning of the world. Yet at point after point, as I have just been showing, war has been ended. Families, cities, states, even some nations no longer fight. Over larger and ever larger units of social organization the reign of peace has come —until today war lingers only in that last and largest unit wherein contacts, as between nations and empires, are so remote that misunderstandings, quarrels, jealousies, hatreds, and hostilities are still possible. But the process of evolution must go on. Civilization must still spread itself abroad, over the largest areas of man's life, until war has been driven across its last frontier, and thus exiled forever into the chaos and black night from which it came. Human nature is learning, in other words, to be friendly, cooperative, and peaceful, even at great distances. Man is moving from loyalty to loyalty, each higher loyalty absorbing the lower, until at last he is destined to attain to that highest loyalty of all, which is humanity, and in its name establish world-wide, universal peace. What man has accomplished on a small scale, he must now accomplish on a universal scale. Not only at home but also abroad, he will make an end to war!

It is in this hope, this faith, that the War Resisters' movement has been organized. If I were to characterize this movement in a single phrase, I would say that it is a group of men and women who would anticipate in their ideas, and in their lives, this highest loyalty to mankind which some day is to bind the race in unity, and establish brotherhood and peace upon the earth. We would do now, at this present moment, what we would wish we had done, were we to live a thousand years hence as citizens of the United States of the World, and look back in amazement and pity upon this dark age of wars and rumors of wars.

What would we think today, for example, if we surveyed the hideous years when Lancastrians and Yorks were turning England into a shambles, as Germans and French were a little while ago turning Europe, and suddenly discovered in that period a group of men who said these "Wars of the Roses," as they were called, were mean and petty and contemptible and wicked, and they would have nothing to do with them —men who declared that they were Englishmen before they were Lancastrians or Yorks, and for England's dear sake they would not fight! Would we not think, if we found such men, that they were the only civilized men, and also the only patriotic Englishmen, alive at that time? And would we not wish, if we had been alive in those days, that we had been men of peace?

Or what do we think, as a matter of fact, when we look at Medieval Italy, where city was warring against city, as nation now wars against nation, and all the brave knights, supported by their lovely ladies, were fighting and dying not for Italy but for Venice, or Verona, or Padua—what do we think, I say, when we see Francis of Assisi, most gallant knight, most reckless warrior, most ardent patriot of them all, suddenly dropping his sword and putting off his armor, and refusing to fight any more, because he loves all Italians, all men, no matter to what city they belong, and will not fight or kill them? This man, in an age of almost universal violence and bloodshed, chose to live at peace, and to seek the ways of brotherhood. He even refused to fight the Moslem infidels, but deliberately went to them as a friend, and sought to save them by his love. What do we think of this Pacifist, this War-Resister? The world has anticipated us long since. It has crowned Francis as a saint, and for his love of peace and brotherhood, has placed him at the right hand of Christ.

And what will posterity think a thousand years hence—our children's children's children's children, who will be living in a world where wars between nations are as inconceivable as wars between cities and states today—what will they think, I say, as they look back upon this dreadful era of conflict and disorder? Will they not agree, these successors of ours, that in our international relationships, at least we are savages? Will they not seek in vain for any rational reconciliation between the politics we practise and the religions we profess? And as they dimly discern, through the shadow of the years, the few transcendent souls who put war out of their lives—who seek in patient faith and steadfast love to turn the hearts of men to the highest loyalty of brotherhood—men like Leo Tolstoy and 'Gene Debs yesterday, and Romain Rolland and Mahatma Gandhi today—will they not calmly say that these are the great souls of our age, the saviours of mankind?

It is with this august company that we would humbly walk. It is to this august company that we would invite your fellowship. It is a company which begins in the far ages of the past, and continues unbroken to our time. Buddha was in this company, when he said, *"Hatred does not cease by hatred; hatred ceases by love."* Isaiah joined this company when he said, *"Resist not evil . . . love your enemies . . . put up thy sword into its place, for they that take the sword shall perish by the sword."* From Jesus' day unto our own, this host has multiplied; in the ages of fiercest fight, it has not dwindled. Today it is mightier than ever—in every land, beneath every flag, the sacred host of *those who will not fight.* Not because they are afraid, but because they have the courage of their faith; not because they do not love their country,

but because they love it too well to make it hostile to mankind; not because they are disloyal or traitorous, but because, like Paul, they would *"not be unfaithful to the heavenly vision."* These are citizens of America, England, Germany—yes! but they are also children of God, and therefore brothers one of another.

So the world is ending war. Step by step, man writes his record of human nature, climbing out of the narrow confines of discord and hate, up to the broader levels of concord and amity. Our friend, the Admiral, is wrong—and a man of little faith. He knows not the spirit we are of. Ages ago man set his feet in the paths of peace—and already, in our time, he sees the shining goal.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Social Democracy and Empire

"A people which oppresses another people cannot itself be free."—Karl Marx.

The Labor Party has no doubt already forgotten its Indian record in 1930. To judge from recent fulminations against Fascism by our Labor and Trade Union leaders,* one might imagine that they had never, either in 1924 or 1929, taken office as the presiding Cabinet of an Empire. The recent speeches of Henderson and Benn, of Lansbury and Citrine, contrast as oddly with their attitude in office as their achievements did with their promises. They will, of course, remind us in turn that they were "a minority Government"—as though Hitlerism could be justified by proving that the Nazis were a minority—but that was not their main plank when in power. Where Imperialism was concerned their trump card was always a pious horror of "nationalism" which it was their duty as "Socialists" to suppress.

As an active propagandist against imperialism I came up against this point of view continually. Wasn't the Indian nationalist movement bourgeois? Wouldn't the withdrawal of the British from the Colonies leave them at the mercy of other imperialists or of native capitalists? The blatant hypocrisy of this attitude as a defense of British imperialism disgusted me personally more than any defense I ever heard from the Tories. Here was a government of "Socialists" and "Democrats," hand in glove with the capitalists (as any "minority" Government must be—and by its own choice) in the robbery and repression of the Colonies, solemnly justifying its share in the loot and butchery by saying that if it didn't someone else would. Could not every capitalist make the same claim?

The points that stand out in the record of the Labor Party may be summarized as follows:

Firstly, Imperialism is the major issue in British politics. Imperial Policy in India and the Crown Colonies involves over 10 lives for every one involved in domestic policy.

The Labor Party, by relegating it to a secondary or tertiary matter, proved that they were themselves nationalist in the worst sense of the term.

Secondly, the Labor Party, which claims to be "democratic" wielded without scruple the autocratic power possessed by the Imperial Government, including the suppression of free speech and free press in India, imprisonment without trial, etc. (see the May Day leaflet quoted in footnote) *in defiance of all the canons of political democracy in which they professed belief.*

Thirdly, the robbery of the colonial masses under their rule continued unabated both in respect of "national" debts, investments, pay and pensions of administrators, etc. and the extortions of native princes, landowners and money-lenders, which were carried out with the support of British "law and order" (or "minimum force" as Wedgwood Benn so happily put it).

Fourthly, a fresh barrier was put in the way of international working-class unity both by the general policy of continued imperialist robbery and repression and by the singling out of the most militant workers in India, whose trial at Meerut continued throughout the Labor Government of 1929-31. Thus a great rift was made between the Indian workers and those who had been induced to support Social-democracy in England.

The British worker was, in fact, identified with the whole policy of Imperialism; and it became increasingly difficult to represent this in India as *capitalist* imperialism, when all classes in Britain appeared to support it. Hence the nationalism in India which so horrified the British Social-democrats was something which they themselves did more than anyone else to foment by increasing racial as distinct from class antagonism.

It is not my purpose in this article to give a detailed account of Social Democracy in action. In India, where my knowledge of events was first hand, the achievements of Wedgwood Benn and Lord Irwin were quite as brutal as anything subsequently perpetrated by Sir Samuel Hoare and Lord Willingdon. The main difference was that the *Daily Herald,* which today performs its duty as an "opposition" paper (with cautious criticisms of the Government) was in 1930 an enthusiastic supporter of the Government, though the same Prime Minister was pursuing substantially the same Indian policy. The *Herald* joined the Labor leaders in drawing a veil over the atrocities and eulogized Lord Irwin, the Indian princes and the other "delegates" whom Irwin had sent over to "represent" India at the Round Table Conference, covering every expedient with the slogan "A Government must Govern." They might as well have said "A burglar must burgle."

The historic reason for this attitude taken up by Social Democracy is not difficult to discover. For over a century a bourgeois democratic revolution in Britain has gone on side by side with imperial expansion. Both in their fight for political power at home and in their struggle for colonial mastery the British bourgeoisie found it necessary to seek the alliance of the British working class; and that class (under Trade Union leadership) bid at every point for the *price* of its support. Point by point the British workers gained political enfranchisement, a relatively high standard of living (compared with workers in other countries) and the best health services. Our own capitalists, enriched by the robbery of the Colonies, could afford to yield all these concessions and remain the richest in the world. Even today, when this system of *Panes et circenses* is collapsing, and bullying is once more replacing bribery on the home front, we deceive ourselves if we fail to recognize that poverty in Britain, with

---

*The following is from the May Day leaflet issued by the National Joint Council, Transport House:

"By methods of terrorism and militarist dictatorship . . . the tyranny of an irresponsible autocracy backed by lawless gangs. . . . Suppression of free speech, the free press, and the right of public assembly; the bludgeoning of peaceable citizens, domiciliary searches, the murder or brutal maltreatment of political opponents; intimidation, false witness, illegal proscription and criminal violence—these are the weapons that have been used in Germany, to batter down the defenses of civilization and social order."

Every word of this would apply to the Labor Government's own record in India as I saw it in 1930.

all its horrors, is mild compared with poverty in most other countries. *The "dole" is still about seven times the average income in India; and should imperialism there collapse, it is certain that British Capitalism (if it survived at all) could no longer maintain its unemployed even at the present figure. That would mean revolution.*

As the crisis deepens this fact is becoming clearer. Afraid of the revolutionary alternative—the expropriation of our own industrialists, mine owners, land owners, etc. and the utilization of national wealth under workers' control, the Labor Party clings tighter than ever to imperialism as the only other hope. In a sense we have no proletariat. We have become a parasitic nation, living on the backs of colonial slaves, like the Roman plebs of an earlier Empire. As capitalism collapses our workers see themselves driven down slowly toward the same coolie standards that obtain in those colonies, largely because of the ironical contradiction in capitalism itself, which has exploited that coolie labor to the ultimate destruction of the home industries. The jackal's share of the British worker in this imperial plunder is thus being undermined, and a Marxist policy of united action with the colonial masses becomes every day more urgent. In face of this fact, and indeed *on account of it,* the Labor Party policy by a concentration on "domestic" affairs and a studied evasion of the imperialist (and major) issue, is bolstering up the system of exploitation. If the British workers must live either by sharing in the robbery of the colored workers or by expropriating their own capitalists, our Social-democrats are determined that they shall follow the former procedure, as their actions prove in spite of their "face-saving" phrases and gestures. Even their "socialism" is only, on analysis, a scheme for state capitalism—i. e., the re-distribution of the colonial tribute among themselves. For the British worker this policy, if continued, would mean a long-drawn-out degradation and ultimate extinction; but for the Trade Union or Party Boss it means a quiet life, a comfortable salary and ultimate absorption into bourgeois society in his own generation.

It is to Marx himself that we must turn for the way out. As an international socialist Marx realized that freedom begins at the bottom, and that the bottom dog in world capitalism is the colonial worker. Hence, paradoxically, a *nationalist* movement in the colonies which tends to overthrow economic imperialism (and removes an obstacle from the forward march of the colonial masses toward power) is *objectively* revolutionary. On the other hand a "Labor" government, dominating and exploiting the colonial masses, is no more revolutionary than an errand boy who becomes a junior partner. The Bourgeois revolution in the West, which put a political weapon into the hands of our workers, marks a definite stage in our own evolution from Feudalism and Autocracy toward the Proletarian Revolution. But if the power gained by the Western workers through Parliamentary "democracy" is used to hinder the same process in Asia or Africa, the net effect is overwhelmingly anti-democratic and retrogressive.

The Labor Party, in identifying itself with Imperial autocracy and Indian feudalism (against both the Indian Bourgeois revolution and the mass of colonial workers and peasants) took a position which (so far from being in advance of that "19th Century Nationalism" it deprecates) was a hundred years behind it. Asia is indeed passing through the phases of our own 19th century history; but that does not lay on us the duty of supporting the Bourbons and Hapsburgs of our age. On the contrary, the way to help the colonies into the 20th century is to set them free so far as our own domination and robbery is concerned, and push on the work of the Meerut martyrs toward the formation of Workers and Peasants Republics by the colonial races themselves.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS

The Birth-Pangs of a New Era

"Birthpangs of a New Era," implies the hope that life and not death is coming out of the present agony. Either civilization is perishing of its over-weight of material mechanism, or else a new world organization with a spiritual ideal is coming to birth. We who cherish human life, deeply sense the continued stand of vested interests and so-called divine rights against the common good of humanity. Nevertheless, we may fear to face the fact that possibly we ourselves and those nearest and dearest to us, the social and political groups which stand high in our regard, may be parties to the vast inhumanity to man which makes countless thousands mourn. Perhaps we who have the intelligence and resources to aid the birth of a new era, are clinging to an outworn world-view which is already dead and which means nothing to the rising generation. Possibly our philosophy of life has been more romantic than scientific, content with "scrutin' the inscrutable," as our colored friend would say, rather than "scrutinizing the scrutable," with all that that might imply as per the scientific technique applied to everyday life. It can easily be that our visions have had wings, but not hands or feet. It is altogether possible that we have "glorified God in the highest," and yet have been impotent to realize "peace and good will among men."

If I should turn to philosophy to find a suitable peg upon which to hang some thoughts, perhaps I would take the statement found in the preface of Morris Cohen's book, "Reason and Nature,"

> Modern thought emphasizes mobility and the principle that everything changes to something else and must indeed become something other than it was in order to exhibit its true character.

If I should turn to science, I suppose I should take the words, "Every effect must have a cause, and is in turn a cause for something else." If I should turn to the prophets, I would read in the 37th chapter of Isaiah, "This is a day of trouble and of rebuke and of blasphemy; for the children are come to the birth, and there is not strength to bring forth." If I should turn to poetry, I might consider the words,

> We are the Music Makers,
> We are the dreamers of dreams,
> Wandering by lone sea breakers
> And sitting by desolate streams,—
> World losers and world forsakers,
> On whom the pale moon beams.
> Yet, we are the movers and shakers
> Of the world forever, it seems.

We, in the ages lying
In the buried past of the earth,
Built Nineveh with our sighing
And Babel itself with our mirth,
And o'erthrew them with prophesying
To the old of the new world's worth.
For each age is a dream that is dying
Or one that is coming to birth.

We are witnessing the birth-pangs of a new era. No longer does it pass unchallenged that "the natural right of the best people is to have the best things, that wealth is the evidence of individual probity, and punishment the only proper treatment of crime, that the foreigner is to be kept in his proper place as a drudge, to be treated kindly but firmly, that the army and navy are the loyal defenders of the nation, and that the worship of the church is the proper expression of all decent and respectable people." No longer are we satisfied that ignorance is bliss. If it were, this world would be much happier than it is.

There are four phases in which I believe the new era will either come to birth, or else never see the light of the new day.

In the first place, we are passing from an age of pioneers, agrarian and industrial, to an age of social and industrial complexity. Rolvaag so well describes the rugged settlers of the West, battling like "giants in the earth" against hunger, famine and plague. These were the true aristocrats of the old world, braving unseen dangers in an unseen land. A certain spiritual austerity and beauty softened the hard lines inflicted on their lives by the impersonal forces of nature. But with their courage there was often blended brutality, so that when the land was finally under control, they turned with the same spirit to the control of human beings. The new industrialism found them as powerful as the feudal knights, the chief difference being that they lived in a bank instead of a castle, and brandished a check of credit instead of a sword. Spiritual vulgarity, softness of living, and faithlessness in the average man began to characterize life. The doctrine of the survival of the fittest took on a different color. The struggle not only to survive but to surmount and dominate was carried on with as much or more ruthlessness against human beings as it had been against the forces of nature in the earlier days.

In this development, the earlier necessary thrift and frugality in ekeing out a bare existence from the soil turned into a sordid scramble for wealth, and the amassing of huge private fortunes through the exploitation of natural wealth and human lives. No longer was the mere gaining of a livelihood but the piling up of surplus profits the incentive to work. Men became sublimated chipmunks, putting their dollars into banks, like nuts into a hole. While, democratically enough, we reacted against the caste system in Europe, we developed a rigid class stratification of our own—so much so that while for the first time in the history of mankind there is today the means and power available to release the good life for all, most people have no decent chance to make good. Men cower, starved and fearful, in the midst of plenty. Joy and beauty fade from human living.

The outlook is not hopeful for the poverty-stricken and unemployed. Since the economic crash four years ago, technological advance has been so rapid that even a return to the production peak of 1929 would result in the employment for only a little over one-half of the workers formerly needed by industry.

In the second place, we are passing from a puritanical age to one of unsurpassed liberty. There is a definite movement away from negative disrespect, involving superstition, awe and magic, to one of positive respect for human nature. The code of morals in the past was imposed from without and did the mischief, and resulted in the repressions and perversions about which modern psychology has taught us so much. Church leaders and moral reformers spent much of their time in transcendental politics, pruning and curbing so-called "evil" human nature. Girls were simply supposed to "make an impression," and boys were to become healthy and wealthy, and if neither were possible, then to become wise.

The past generation preached repentance with a vengeance but *not in regard to significant sins.* We know what sin is today but do not preach repentance. We are sentimentalists; yet to Europe we are the biggest of hypocrites. There is little social idealism that has any measure of influence today. There seems to be no one great passion or coherence to morals and ideals. With all the fine stuff in life, little of it is disciplined. All the advice that some leaders can give is that since we do not know what to do, it were best that we do nothing at all.

On the one hand we have 90 percent or more neutral respectable people—neither very good nor very bad—who cannot stand either really good people or really evil people, and who therefore hang Jesus and the thief on the same hill. Then we have the small cult of the uninhibited—the "arty" people who create no art—who spend most of their time avoiding conventional morality. At the other extreme we find those whose intelligence and conscience have really been socialized and who are honestly trying to release the life of the spirit, to make possible abundant, beauteous and laughing life for all.

In the third place, we are passing from an era of nationalism to one of international significance. Nationalism is dead, yet there seems to be no power great enough to give birth to anything else. The large loyalty of yesterday becomes a narrow vice today. We are told that nationalism is a doctrine which dries up the springs of humanity, and that cheap patriotism is the last resort of the perverted mind. We reject the idea of empire building, yet tolerate an economic imperialism propped up on bayonets. We believe in "peace," yet spend two million dollars daily for wars, past, present and future. We know it is wrong to kill, yet we are like the Israelites of old, who would not harm a fellow Israelite, but who could without the slightest compunction kill all the Moabites and Philistines they could lay their hands on, women and children included. We believe in "justice" and "brotherhood," but not for the poor and powerless nor for the minority races abroad or at home. We are sometimes like the English gentlemen of whom Bertrand Russell speaks, who could "make pheasants and tenants suffer: when occasion arises they can shoot a rhinoceros or a German. But in more useful arts they are entirely deficient."

In looking out upon the nations of the East today, we are faced with a situation similar to that confronting the king in Mother Goose's storehouse, you remember:

Sing a song of sixpence,
A pocket full of rye;
Four and twenty blackbirds
Baked in a pie.

When the pie was opened
The birds began to sing;
Was that not a dainty dish
To set before the king?

So we find that the blackbirds, and the brownbirds, and the yellowbirds are all singing in our pie today—and the dish is *not* so dainty! China, India and Africa are bound by definite ties to the dwellers in our cities and towns today. The ends of the earth are this very minute the ends of this room. The old patriotism must give way to the new neighborliness. Tagore says, "No nation can find its own salvation by breaking away from others. We must all be saved or we must perish together." Science has made it technically possible to substitute cooperation for competition in both economics and international politics. There are now between 300 and 400 international organizations linking together in understanding and cooperation the peoples of the earth. That trend must go on until we find ourselves becoming free citizens not of this or that piece of land but of the universe.

Finally, we are leaving behind the denominationalism and sectarianism of our fathers. These divisions carry on by sheer momentum, confusing the vision and dividing the energies and loyalties of men. The issues of religion are being settled outside, in the workaday world. Many church leaders are turning away, reluctantly enough, from denominational housekeeping to lead the forces of social idealism. The leaders of world religions are escaping the bonds of tradition to grapple with world problems in a practical way.

Traditional theology maintained that all persons inherited sin, but that few could be saved. Modern thought says that if sin is social, virtue is also social. If there is oneness in evil, there is oneness in salvation. No one can be saved *from* society: he must be saved *with* it. No man can be saved of himself or to himself alone. *A redeemed humanity* is the aim of the most effective religious leaders everywhere. They realize that if religion is to function democratically it must break loose from ecclesiastical machinery and become a part of community life. If preaching is to mean anything it will transform the individual into a social creator who goes forth to battle for the larger good.

The old dualism of "sacred" and "secular" realms is dead, and chaos seems to be the next step for many. But what seems to be the pains of death to the embryonic babe, may well be the entrance into the new era of abundant living. Coming at life by way of theology is a played-out procedure; but coming at religion by way of life is a procedure full of promise. The business of getting men into heaven, or its counterpart Nirvana, amounted to sheer nothingness for most persons, so that Mark Twain was not far from wrong in choosing heaven for climate but hell for company.

The noblest ideals of human relationships are not modern at all; they have been known and preached for thousands of years, Buddha, Confucius, Moses, Christ, Mohammed, Krishna, to wit. But practice lagged woefully behind. Now modernism, being a world-wide movement which finds the same fundamental problems in all lands, demands a new religious synthesis of life. Practical programs must be found to direct habit, custom and institutions toward the abundant life. Though men realize that the goods of life do not necessarily make the good life, neither can the truly good life today exist apart from culturally creative "goods." To furnish these on a universal scale seems to be an insurmountable task; yet it simply means solving concrete problems piecemeal. This is akin to the story of Studdert Kennedy who served as a Chaplain in the British army in the Great War. "Chappie," asked one of the men, "How in the world do you get rid of cooties? I've tried boiling them out, and ironing them out, and sprinkling powder all over me clothes." "The only way I know," answered the "Chappie," "is to get after them one by one."

Thus will the birth-pangs and the head-splitting problems of the new era be solved—by getting after them one by one! Because the task is difficult and dangerous does not make it indispensable. No longer is it a question as to whether we care to choose the social point of view and apply the scientific method to the age-old problems of pain, hunger and poverty; the question now stands, will we choose them or catastrophe? As one has written, "All that is absolutely worthwhile has something of the unattainable about it. No faith can live today in anything but a fool's paradise unless it ventures out into the high and open, but biting air of critical reason as natural science does."

We can choose either the glorious possibility of a new society guaranteeing comfort, cultural creativeness and beauty of living to all, or we can choose disaster. There is only one justification, after all, for the intellectual and religious life, and that is to improve the conditions of life, creating the means whereby life may become increasingly good. To carry this standard of practical idealism from cathedral, temple and church into the marketplaces and laboratories of the world is our task. We can focus the inspirational powers of love and righteousness that have always been the pride of religion, together with accurate scientific knowledge upon social maladjustments, thus gradually weaving the pattern of the religious ideal—the truly good life—into the fabric of human lives.

WALTER VOGELMANN.

Elmore, Ohio.

The Jews

They were denied, and yet they dared affirm;
They were oppressed, and yet they dared ignore
The epithets of "dog" and viler "worm"
Flung at their ears, harassing each old sore
Injustice made, with salt of new disgrace.
The shops and crafts, the fields they sought to till,
Remained the precincts of a stronger race,
Demanding tribute to tyrannic will.
But stifling ghettoes could not cramp those hearts
Whose fathers had inherited wide lands,
Nor the monopoly of fields and arts
Extort the cunning from their earnest hands.
When doors were closed, they sought the constant sky,
And claimed Resources man could not deny!

ELINOR LENNEN.

To One of the Chief Priests

"To talk of the elimination of poverty is impious, for Jesus Christ said . . ."—Cardinal. . . .

"Ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good; but me ye have not always."—Jesus, shortly before his murder by the priests.

"Ye have the poor with you always," you say that Jesus said,
O swine-jowled prelate, tombed in fat where sight and soul are dead!
I hear the scornful sentence, each fierce word bitter-true:
"Still men shall want, while they give heed to hirelings such as you."

KENNETH W. PORTER.

What Price Intelligence?

It was in the summer of 1925, eight years ago, that William Jennings Bryan and Clarence Darrow met in a forensic contest at Dayton, Tennessee, which attracted the attention of the civilized world. The outcome, although a technical victory for the Fundamentalists was a Pyrrhic victory, and the defeated liberals so triumphed in the court of common judgment that they were filled with glee. Yet now that we are in a situation which seems wholly removed from the apparently unrealistic issues which Bryan and Darrow discussed it may be pertinent to this hour, beyond ordinary suspicion, to examine that discussion and discover whether either side has made any progress since then. Possibly it will appear that the contest was on both sides unrealistic mainly by reason of the fact that we are still living, whether liberals or orthodox, in the identical world in which they lived, and that our own economic mess is what it is because of this hangover of misunderstanding the conflict of 1925 did but dramatize.

I have used the word "identical," above, with deliberation, and to convey more than on the face of it the word in that connection seems to convey. Two things I would argue here, whether I can argue them convincingly or not in view of the fact that they contradict so much of common prejudice and belief. The first is the fact, as I hold it, that Bryan and Darrow were in the main involved in the same confusion of thought, and reversed the major realities with which we have to do in both instances. The second, is the yet more important fact, according to the revolutionary convictions to which I have come out of long study and observation, that our whole world confusion, not only in the realm of theology but in the matter of fact world of industry and commerce and political relationships, is mainly due to the failure of religionists and irreligionists to get away from the mistake in which the "Great Commoner" and the Great Lawyer were alike entangled. Neither of them knew, and most of us do not know to this day what price intelligence involves. Brash as it may seem I was about to say, and I think I will say, that in general neither the conservatives nor the liberals of our day know what intelligence is.

Readers of UNITY will remember that about a year and a half ago I carried in that periodical on two or three occasions an appeal on behalf of what I called "The Intelligent America Fellowship." There may have been some question on the part of such readers of UNITY as responded to my appeal, and possibly others from whom I did not hear, as to why the matter was dropped, and why no communication has appeared from my pen in all these months. It is not that the response was lacking, though no great number of people wrote me. But the number was greater than I was able to properly serve by way of correspondence. In no year for many years have I used my typewriter and pen so little as in the past year. And this for the reason mainly that the calls upon my time and strength through immediate personal contacts were overwhelming. Public addresses anywhere from four to ten times a week, innumerable individual interviews, and the everyday incidentals of home and town life have all but silenced me for the outside world. Finally, with this as one of the major reasons for getting away from Los Angeles, my wife and I beat a retreat to our old home in Los Gatos. Yet even so, I have found similar work waiting me here, and have been back to Los Angeles for ten days of crowded engagements within the past three weeks. This much of explanation I owe to correspondents whom I have neglected, and to whom I can hardly give personal attention now. When I get to heaven, if I make the grade, about the first thing I am going to ask for is a first class secretary. I have had none for a lifetime now.

This much of personal explanation given, rather reluctantly, I turn to the primary values which the work of The Intelligent America Fellowship has brought to fuller consciousness in me. I began with a very modest desire to contribute to American intelligence over a wide range of what is conventionally recognized as intelligence. Classes, lectures, and interviews that made me dizzy with their intensity and duration I carried on with an enthusiasm and energy which alarmed my wife, who knows my age sometimes more realistically than I know it myself. And out of it all came the conviction, first of all, that I could better afford to spend myself on fewer men and women, at greater depths of understanding, and more recently the hope that I might return to the printed page with this larger message, and possibly reach some whom I cannot meet face to face.

Can the message be stated in a few words? I hope so. It is, in substance, that both liberals and orthodox, Bryans and Darrows, for instance, are still outside of the intelligence which is shaking down the world of our day in the travail of a new birth of human understanding. Both are dealing with a world of ideas, rather than with a world of *mass-experience* and *social-process*.

Here, by way of proof and example, is a sentence from the address which Bryan wrote just before his sudden death, and which he did not live to deliver on the platform. He is arguing for the primacy of the idea.

"Who ever built a house," he asks, "who did not have first of all the idea of a house?" To which the very simple, but utterly devastating reply, is the inquiry: "And who ever had the idea of a house who had never seen a house, or never experienced and observed the use of a house?" Back of every house is something of the total architectural *experience* of the race, as back of every other idea is a body of material experience. Materialism is the root of all intelligence, whatever the origin of the organ, or organs, with which we apprehend.

Yet here is a modern liberal, as far away from Bryan as Darrow himself, the English historian, H. G. Wells, who in his notable "Outline of History," after getting away from traditional hero-worship, militarism, and nationalistic emphasis falls for the ideological delusion as sophomorically as Bryan himself. He avows again and again that he is writing from the viewpoint of the priority of ideas. "The history of the world is the history of ideas," he says.

So, I suppose, the ideas dropped down from heaven, like the manna of the Mosaic story. Or did they grow wild out of the earth, like the wheat or barley of the Nile Valley, where agriculture possibly began?

Otherwise they must have come by way of experience, that totality of experience which is the real warp and woof of world thought. Grant that ideas are themselves fruitful of other ideas. What of it? How are they fruitful except as they are planted in experience again? Otherwise how explain the failure of Greece, in her palmiest days of abstract reasoning, to anticipate England in the development of the Industrial Revolution and the sequence of scientific understanding which has flowed from this improvement in material, or instrumental, technique?

Leaving aside all questions of the manner in which man came to his human status, a process evidently material in its mould at least, is not this formula, which I have used over and over again in my teaching of the past two or three years, a key-formula to practically all the areas of human variation, racial, national, geneological, and cultural?

We Are What We Are Because We Are Where We Are, and When We Are

There is *geographical determinism,* which even conservatives are recognizing in large measure, perhaps with over particularity, today. *Where we are.* Who can deny the tremendous range of this natural determinism?

And *there,* also, is *economic determinism,* in the broadest use of that term. *When we are.* Can there be any question as to the fundamental character of our status according to the chronological relations in which we stand?

There is no intelligence with respect to America, pertinent to our time, and adequate to our crisis, which cannot answer these following six questions. These also are my own, the product in part of the past ten years concentration upon human experience, American and otherwise.

Why did Europe discover America instead of America discovering Europe?

Why did the Red Man lose out to the White Man in America?

Why did the Continental European lose out to the Englishman in America?

Why did the South lose out to the North in America?

Why did the West lose out to the East in America?

Why did Yesterday lose out to Today in America?

Perhaps I shall discuss these inquiries later, but it is enough to say now that not one of these fundamental problems concerning our own hemisphere and country can be answered by way of either the individual or ideological approach. Nor can any other fundamental problem of our day.

ROBERT WHITAKER

The Study Table

Henry George

This* is a highly important book. It would be thus important if only because it brings to memory the great name of Henry George. Professor John Dewey, who writes the Foreword to the volume, has declared that we do not need to use all the fingers of two hands to count the men worthy to be ranked in human history with Henry George as original thinkers in the field of social philosophy. The "prophet of San Francisco," as Louis Post called him, was not only a typical American in his career and character, but one of the greatest of Americans in his achievements. "Progress and Poverty," his immortal masterpiece, which Dewey supposes "has had a wider distribution than almost all other books on political economy put together," is one of the outstanding events of the nation's history. It is doubtful if many Americans adequately estimate the true ranking of Henry George among the supreme men whom the country has produced. This book will teach them to recognize "the indelible impress" left by this heroic thinker and reformer "on not only his own generation and country but on the world and the future." When the new and free society at last comes upon the earth, Henry George will be enrolled among its builders.

But this book is chiefly important because it gives for the first time an adequate summary of George's philosophy, and interpretation of its significance as a creative contribution to man's life and thought. "The full sweep of George's ideas," says Dewey, "is not at all adequately grasped by the American public, not even by that part which has experienced what we call a higher education. . . . This lack of knowledge of the wider and deeper aspects of his thinking marks a great intellectual loss. In saying this, I am not speaking of acceptance of his ideas but of acquaintance with them, the kind of acquaintance that is expected as a matter of course of cultivated persons with other great social thinkers, irrespective of adoption or non-adoption of their policies."

This lack is abundantly supplied, this loss made good, by Professor Geiger's voluminous and authoritative study. Here is a splendid retelling of the thrilling story of George's life. This is followed by an elaborate statement of his "single tax" theories as a solution of the characteristic economic problem of poverty allied with progress. Henry George's ethical and religious teachings are carefully examined, his relationship to Socialism defined and interpreted, his furious controversy with Herbert Spencer recounted, his influence weighed, his challenge to all established doctrines and institutions of social life evaluated. Professor Geiger is master of every detail of his subject. While sympathetic, even eulogistic, he is at the same time vigorously critical. This book is no empty tribute. It is an authoritative survey and estimate, on the level of highest scholarship, of one great man's unique and potent service to mankind. Professor Geiger rightly lays emphasis upon Henry George's spiritual qualities. George saw, with unwavering vision, that "this problem of poverty may . . . be most suggestively laid at the door of ethics." His challenge was not merely of truth, but also of justice and righteousness. More than any other thinker of his time he revealed the iniquity of the existing social order, and demanded its moral reformation. He was in the true line of the prophets.

We shall cherish this book as a precious possession.

*"The Philosophy of Henry George," by George R. Geiger. Published by the Macmillan Co. $3.00.

We hope that it will find its way into all American libraries. What had not been done before has now been done with finality. Henry George has at last found his interpreter to posterity.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

"Once Upon a Time and Today"

Just now, when anti-Semitism is raising its ugly head in so many places, we have a particularly timely book,* the reminiscences of a Jewess of great ability whose long life has been a blessing to the United States. The fairy godmothers who surrounded Maud Nathan's cradle gave her health, wealth, beauty, talent, and, best of all, a warm heart and the will to do good.

Her parents taught their children to respect the feelings of persons of other faiths. On Sundays they were not allowed to play croquet or to practice their piano exercises, out of consideration for the neighbors. But they were well grounded in the teachings of their own religion. She says:

> In the light of the present, I can now appreciate the value of this training. If I have been able to express in my life, standards, ideals, a code of ethics, that have spelled helpfulness to others, has it not been because the roots were laid in a distinctive religious background? Does it make any difference whether our youth have, as a background, Jewish principles, Christian principles, or the principles of any of the great religions of the East? Is not the essential thing that they have a real spiritual background upon which to build character?

Business reasons took the family for a few years to Green Bay, Wis. There she was cured of what she calls the provincialism of imagining that New Yorkers were somehow superior, and that everything of importance must start from there.

She married, very young, a cousin much her senior. Half a century later she wrote of him, "His constant companionship has been the richest blessing of my life." One of the delightful things about this delightful book is the glimpse that it gives us of a thoroughly happy marriage. Beginning housekeeping in New York while still in her teens, she shocked her family by letting her maids have many evenings out, and by fitting up a comfortable room in the basement where they might receive their male friends. This was thought "most radical." Through the influence of Josephine Shaw Lowell, she became interested in prison reform, and was drawn more and more into public work. She had the vitality of twenty ordinary mortals, and it is surprising to read of the work she did in many different lines, while carrying on at the same time a full and brilliant social life. Her ancestors, she says, gave her a constitution that enabled her to work all day and play all the evening, without fatigue; and she thoroughly enjoyed it. All her family were very conservative, except her husband. He stood by her in everything. If she had to leave home to attend a convention or give an address, he always went with her:

> It sometimes meant a probable monetary loss, when the Stock Exchange was active; but he never considered a money loss equivalent to a loss of companionship, or a loss of spiritual values.

The birth of her only child—long desired in vain—made her sympathies still wider:

> It seemed as though all the love during those years of waiting had been slowly growing, until at last it welled up and overflowed, embracing not only the tiny creature lying in the hollow of my arm, but the whole world besides.

The loss of this gifted little daughter almost broke her heart. Again it was Josephine Shaw Lowell who drew her out of her absorbing sorrow into work "to make the lives of many thousands of girls less sordid and less gray." She was President for many years of the National Consumers' League. Her book, "The Story of an Epoch-Making Movement," tells of the work of that society. There is no room here even to enumerate her varied activities in many humanitarian lines. She was one of the first women to preach in a synagogue, and was a pioneer among Jewish women in going outside of Jewish philanthropy and communal work. She made many trips to Europe, where she associated with titles and with crowned heads; and she came home to work for the poorest of the people. She was a friend and admirer of Theodore Roosevelt, and helped to convert him to woman suffrage. She had been herself converted by her experience in the Consumers' League; and what an able advocate she was! How effectively she used to marshal the flags of all the nations that had given women a vote. She took all her responsibilities seriously. She would never accept a position as director unless she could attend the meetings and really help to direct. She says:

> I have never accepted an invitation to speak unless I felt sure I had a message to give. I have spoken on industrial conditions, the ethics of domestic service, responsibilities of consumers, equal rights for women, the position of women throughout the centuries, the points of contact and agreement between Judaism and Christianity. I have spoken at International Congresses, before Committees of Congress and State Legislatures, in churches, colleges, schools, at political gatherings in large halls and in parlors. I have given addresses in English, French and German, but I have always made it a rule to decline any invitation to speak on subjects which did not lie close to my heart.

The Jewish question crops up here and there in the narrative. She recalls the sensation it made, almost half a century ago, when a Saratoga hotel announced that it would receive no Jews in future, except two families who had been its guests for many years. That was the first open manifestation of a prejudice that has now become widespread. Until the persecutions in Europe brought in a flood of refugees from Russia, Poland and Roumania, the phrase "the Jewish problem" was hardly heard. Mrs. Nathan had always stood by her people. At a Conference of the Federation of Churches of Christ, a series of speakers urged the need of "Christianizing" business. Mrs. Nathan reminded them that "three outstanding firms, in New York, Boston and Sacramento, had standards so high that they served as a measuring rod for others; and these three were owned and managed by Jews."

This book is the story of a rich, vivid, colorful life. It is told with modesty and at the same time with spirit. It has a double interest, as bringing out a beautiful character, and as showing the vast changes that have come about during one human life. Mrs. Nathan says:

> Memories are part of our spiritual wealth. Land, houses, gold and jewels are our material wealth. These we bequeath to our heirs. Our memories die with us unless we record them, and thus leave them as a rich legacy to those who follow.

We have reason to be grateful to all who like Mrs. Nathan, put their worth-while memories in black and white. ALICE STONE BLACKWELL

*Once Upon a Time and Today, by Maud Nathan; with Foreword by Carrie Chapman Catt and Introduction by Dr. Henry Van Dyke. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. $2.50.

Correspondence

The Hitler Horror

Editor of UNITY:

This letter will be sent to you from outside Germany and I take advantage of that to write a few words relative to existing conditions here. I long to do something to help right these wrongs, but at present cannot but remain quiet and passive. I refer to the many arrests of Jews and pacifists who are classed as criminals and treated accordingly. Political enemies of the government you know of as being deprived of all rights; leaders in jail, the ones left free not being free in reality, and deprived of work, etc., etc. While my sympathies are aroused for all suffering injustice, I am helpless but to call your attention and those who love decency and freedom to the plight of the Jews and the pacifists. Both these peoples "must be stamped out and will be"!

Judging by the papers one may think the Jews are not in danger now, but this is not true. The Jewish horror is stale *news,* and we know the public must always have something new to feed upon. The old persecutions go on and new ones of different variety are added. The plight of the Jews is the worst thing that has happened in any country in any age, for it has been adjusted here *to the coming ages.* It cannot be overcome or softened, since laws to regulate and perpetuate the treatment of all Jews have been enacted.

When Abraham Lincoln went down the Mississippi, he finally reached New Orleans in its heyday of the slave trade. When he saw the public slave block, where they were auctioning living men and women, he clenched his fist and said, "If I ever have the power, I will smash that." The Jews are surely as entitled to help and sympathy as were the Negroes, and there cannot live any one who would not shudder if they realized what has taken place here and is still happening. To have stood the whole five hundred thousand against the wall and shot them would have been kinder than to have deprived them for all time of their civil rights and their opportunities of making a living and developing their talents and attaining high standing when capable of doing so. England has tried and is trying to aid those scientific men who have been deprived of their posts, but this does not help those hundreds of thousands of young men and women, capable, industrious, and talented, who are condemned to pass their lives in the shadow of this awful thing. There is *no* outlet; they cannot emigrate; no one wants them at this stage of a world crisis.

I decry reprisal as a means of punishment, but something that hurts is the only weapon the outside world can wield with effect. Five months have passed, and no German out of all the sixty-five millions has raised his or her voice to denounce what has been done. There will be no outcry, either, for the government has acted according to the expressed or unexpressed wishes of the whole. The government is inviting foreigners to come here to see for themselves that Jews are not molested. I have no reason to think foreigners will see anything to offend them; such dreadful deeds are not done in the open but under cover, in the dark. Laws are enacted with due respect to order, but this does not make them any the less severe and abominable. Is there no man who can lead a crusade against this persecution which is a living shame to the world? Boycott and isolation, reprisals that will sting through their thick skins, will be the only thing that can help, if even then. Rather I would prefer to see some world-wide effort to remove all Jews from this country, particularly the young ones who could begin elsewhere and make good.

I pray that the United States and England will not be hoodwinked by powerful statements on *disarmament* into thinking the leopard has changed its spots! A change in the Treaty of Versailles is desired by the Germans—anything to get that! But inside the country there will be no change. I know that every old man and woman in German Jewry would gladly give their lives if something could be done for the young who are destined to fall back into the dark ages which we thought gone forever.

You will ask as others do what is the real reason for all this persecution? I wonder if I can answer it. I have for seven years given deep thought to what I feared might come, but never in my wildest imagination dreamed of the savagery and brutality with which anti-Semitism has been carried out here. From study and observation it is my confirmed belief that there exists a deep desire always to blame some one else for German faults. The Jews are different, and again they are very like, but more intelligent and capable of going beyond the Germans. Their success in business, science and the arts is resented. Germans think that if they are suppressed, and there is no competition, then *they* will benefit. They claim the Jews are international and can't be German, and this is used as a reason to suppress them. They claim "the Jews have degraded the German race, sullied their purity." "Suppression of the Jews will permit the purity of the Germans again to shine as the stars." There are hundreds of equally foolish ideas rampant and brazenly discussed, but all are absurd and beside the point. To be truthful, *jealousy alone is responsible.*

Now for a few words regarding the pacifists. These people, more men than women in this country, are mostly in jail. They are blamed for the war; like the Socialists they are blamed for the Versailles Treaty, for losing the war, and for every other thing under the sun. Property is confiscated, passports seized, and gentle women thrown into jail, and, as in India, mostly without charge and without trial, there to rot and suffer. It is impossible for foreigners to do anything here. Their fate would be expulsion or jail as well. Help, if there comes any, must be from outside. Is there any way or chance of rousing world opinion, for I feel certain that only world opinion and isolation can bring about decent behavior. H.*

*The name of this correspondent cannot be disclosed, for obvious reasons. She is well known, however, to the Editor.—J. H. H.

Defense of India

Editor of UNITY:

Following is a news item, which speaks for itself, taken from the *Sunday Gazette,* London, under the heading of "India C.-in-C. Surprise Visit Home. By the Military Correspondent."

"The future defense of India may be given over to the Royal Air Force, supplemented by light tanks and armored car companies. This possibility lies behind the fact that Field Marshal Sir Philip Chetwode,

Commander-in-Chief in India, is returning to Britain shortly for six months in the middle of the tenure of command, and just when the training season in India is about to begin.

"Half the British Army—more than 60,000 officers and men—is now stationed in India.

"It is being urged in military circles, that India could be defended by 10,000 officers and men of the Air Force, the Tank Corps and Armored Car Companies at a great saving to the Indian and British Exchequers.

"This method of defense has proved successful in Mesopotamia, Irak, Palestine and Aden."

This method has proved "successful" in Africa for a decade. There is an old moral that "chickens come home to roost!" These thousands of airmen in Asia, Near Asia, Africa—after practice on defenseless natives—could reach Rome, Paris, London in a single jump! Better not light a match in a powder mill.

If there is not enough moral indignation in Anglo-Saxondom, as represented by Britain and America, to crush this brutal, unfeeling proposition about bombing from the air, one may well despair. It seems to me that now is the time to speak in protest.

SYDNEY STRONG

Geneva, Switzerland

The Field

(*Continued from page* 310)

monness belongs to the colleges of the North and of the South, of the East and of the West. It afflicts the University of the Philippines as it does the College of New York."

Dr. Thwing quoted from the Manila *Daily Bulletin*:

Students like to parade: If they did not enjoy a lively demonstration better than a class room quiz they would not be normal youths. However, their elders, their teachers and their university authorities, should stick to the purpose for which a university is maintained. That means to make the university an educational institution.

"Many colleges have histories of rebellions destructive of the forces of education, which could have been avoided and easily settled by understanding sympathy on the part both of officers and of undergraduates. In the settlement or the avoidance of such outlawry the president is essentially aided by the sense of patience.

"Be it added also that he will be greatly aided in such adjustments by a sense of humor. This sense, be it emphatically said, has value outside of the field of riots. It is a daily, an hourly sustenance and relief. The sense of humor lessens academic friction. It helps to avoid strained relationships. I know of a president who in a meeting of his trustees in a spell of rather harrowing silence, in the midst of an important debate, said, speaking of a notoriously speechless m e m b e r, 'When Mr. ———— has ceased his prattle, we will go on with our business.' The remark and the contrast broke up the silence, and presently did allow the business to go on and unto a happy conclusion. In college government, wit and a sense of humor are most important concerns. One who is now a distinguished American ambassador was in his youth a teacher of history in an outstanding university. Near the beginning of a lecture, the members of his assembled class were seen to take off their neckties and to hang them on a chair. He felt of his own collar, and exclaimed, 'What, what, what! Have I forgotten to put on my cravat? Pardon.' One of the best examples, too, of both wit and humor is found in the experience of Jowett when he was Vice-Chancellor of Oxford. It is told in his biography:

More than seven hundred Masters of Arts (were) gathered together in the Sheldonian Theatre. The Vice-Chancellor, speaking in Latin, stated the object of the meeting, and then, with a change of tone, announced that to avoid mistakes he would speak in English. His words were received with a shout of laughter. When silence was restored he remarked quietly, yet severely: "I was afraid, gentlemen, that if I spoke in Latin many of you would be unable to understand me!" There was no doubt what would be the decision of the meeting.

Dr. Thwing quoted from an examination paper made up by members of a college class fifteen years after their graduation, supposed to be a sort of transcript of the mid-year examination.

"Write legibly. Number your answers. Carry no ideas into the examination room. Take none away.

"1. Show the relationship between the X-Ray and an algebraic equation containing an unknown quantity.

"2. Point out the successive differences between getting on, getting honor, and getting honest.

"3. Write and explain, with much detail, how a college glee club can pay its bills in quarter notes.

"4. What answer have you to give to the question, What became of the locusts of Pharaoh's Plague? beside the answer that 'John, the Baptist ate them?'

"5. Explain the remark (a) A Senior should not smoke because he is too old, (b) A Junior should not smoke because he is too busy, (c) A Sophomore should not smoke because he is too wise, (d) A Freshman should not smoke because he is too young."

It may not be unfitting to unite the preceding values of sympathy, patience, and humor with a further value which is perhaps the most important of all. It is the value of a comprehensive understanding of religion. This value is not simply to be understood and appreciated by the president; it is also to be incorporated in his character. In this value I emphasize the adjective, *comprehensive*. It should include the great historic faiths. . . .

Let me also say as a concluding remark, that in his holding and using these four forces of sympathy, patience, humor, and religion, the president is to be absolutely sincere. No counterfeit belief or practice serves. His feeling must ring true and his judgment must be sound. No detective is more alert or inquisitive than the college student. He easily recognizes and feels the spurious. Honesty is to prevail; sincerity to rule.

Franklin S. Harris, President of Brigham Young University, at the same meeting, emphasized the thought of "Unity through Cooperation." "The new day has brought to youth an opportunity for world service that was not enjoyed by their parents. They should be able to correct at least a few of the mistakes of past generations.

"The welfare of m a n k i n d throughout the ages has been threatened by man's own folly. He has allowed antagonisms between individuals and groups to dominate and interfere with the achievement of his highest possibilities. Man, the image of his Maker, is marvelously endowed. His body under normal conditions is susceptible of developing almost unbelievable skill; his mind seems infinite in its power to plan; his emotions are delicate and yet so powerful that they make his life colorful and rich. These endowments have in large measure

made him master of his environment.

"With all his gifts man could make of the earth a veritable heaven in which to dwell, but in general he has fallen far short of this high accomplishment. Many factors have contributed to his failure. Certainly one of the most important of these has been his lack of understanding of his fellows and his failure to sympathize with the point of view and motives of those who live in conditions different from his own. Antagonisms have developed in every activity to which man has devoted himself, but in none have they become more acute than in religion."

Dr. Harris here drew attention to the difference in attitude of a certain missionary in Japan and a "group representing the scientists of many nations who were working together without conflict on a project to improve conditions for the Japanese people. There was no thought that, because we came from countries having widely differing political philosophies, we could not work shoulder to shoulder on a scientific problem. . . . Creed differences should have caused no more conflict than was caused by differing political philosophies of the scientists from Russia, England, France, Germany, Japan, China, and the United States. . . .

"The fact that unity of effort, when directed toward some constructive purpose, is more important than either wealth or numerical strength is well illustrated by the accomplishments of one religious group during the last century. They were but a handful of individuals inspired by a common goal. They were intent upon 'building up Zion.'

"It is not necessary here to decide whether or not they were right. For the sake of the illustration we need not pass on the truth or falsity of their religious beliefs nor the desirability of their enterprise. The important thing to bear in mind is that even though they were few in number and without material wealth they had a definite end in view and they were united in their common purpose. Even the individual who is most unsympathetic cannot gainsay the accomplishments of the Mormon pioneers, for it is they to whom I refer. They left their homes in the East and took their hard way across waste places to settle in a land that had been considered beyond redemption. Months of travel were required to move from the comfortable homes they were leaving in Illinois and traverse the dusty, treeless prairies inhabited only by hostile bands of roving Indians. The journey required devotion of a high order and fortitude which comes only to those who have a definite goal in view.

"Those who know the history of the accomplishments of these pioneers, the difficulties surmounted, know that their success resulted from unity of purpose of all who made up the group and the faithfulness with which they carried out the instructions of their leaders. . . .

"Just now the world is in need of greater unification in the field of religion, not because there should be more uniformity of procedure in methods of worship nor because the dogmas should be made the same everywhere, but certainly because there is a call for a centralization on the bigger things in religion in order that the desirable religious impulses of people may not be completely dissipated by petty bickerings regarding inconsequential differences. . . .

"Why not let us who believe in religion as a means of human betterment forget our unimportant differences that take so much of our energies and let us get together on constructive projects that will bring direct results of value, and probably more important, bring the unity that is so desirable among the children of a common Father. It is through those who are now the youth of the world that many of these high purposes must be achieved."

Memorandum from Editor Strong

Expect to arrive in New York during the latter part of July. Address, Care Community Church Center, 550 West 110 Street, New York City.

Plan to go West as far as Seattle about the 1st of September. Address, 508 Garfield St., Seattle, Wash. Willing to speak on:

"An Observer at Geneva for Eighteen Months."

"Geneva—Where American Democracy Began."

"The Case for Total Disarmament."

Variety and Originality!
in the July-August issue of

The New Humanist

HUMANISM AND CREATIVE MORALITY
by Oliver L. Reiser

THE MEANING OF SALVATION FOR SCIENTIFIC NATURALISM
by Horace J. Nickels

HAYDON'S PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION AND HIS METHOD
by Gabriel Rombotis

PSYCHO-SYNTHESIS
Anonymous

MORAL LAWS AS RELATIVE
by Noman Conyers Bradish

SIDNEY HOOK ON KARL MARX
by Llewellyn Jones

THE FREE PLATFORM
by Homer Lewis Sheffer

THE OTHER WORLD
by Bonno Tapper

POETRY
by Carlton Winston
(Mrs. John H. Dietrich)
Hugh S. Orr
Grace Dickinson Sperling

FREE, with a subscription to the New Humanist. A copy of "Humanism in Religion Examined" 83 pages, by R. J. Hutcheon. "HUMANIST RELIGION" by C. W. REESE and the New Humanist for one year $1.25.

THE NEW HUMANIST
105 South Dearborn, St., Chicago
Per copy 25c; Yearly $1.00; Foreign $1.25

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....